

STATEMENT OF SUBJECT MATTER AND APPELLATE JURISDICTION

This case asserts constitutional challenges, under the First and Fourteenth Amendments, to Michigan regulations that govern the licensing of attorneys. On March 28, 2002 Appellant filed his lawsuit in the Eastern District of Michigan seeking prospective (injunctive) relief under 42 U.S.C. §1983. Jurisdiction was based on 28 U.S.C. § 1331, 1343(3) and 2210. (R.1, Complaint, Appx. pp. ____).

After the Appellees filed motions to dismiss, the Eastern District dismissed this lawsuit on June 13, 2002. The Court of Appeals reversed in part and affirmed in part, as reported in Dubuc v Googasian 342 F.3d 610 (6th Cir. 2003). After returning to the Eastern District, the Appellees' motion to transfer was granted and this case was then moved to the Western District of Michigan. (R. 38, Order, Appx. pp. ____).

On March 2, 2004 Appellee John Berry moved for judgment on the pleadings or summary judgment (R.52, Motion, Appx. pp. ____), and on March 18, 2004 Appellant Dennis Dubuc also moved for summary judgment. (R.58, Motion, Appx. pp. ____).

After argument and further briefing, on June 4, 2004 the Court issued its opinion (R. 84, Opinion, Appx. pp. ____) and order (R. 38, Order, Appx. pp. ____), denying Appellant's request for preliminary injunctive relief. On June 17, 2004 the Court issued its opinion (R. 89, Opinion, Appx. pp. ____) and order (R. 90,